United Nations A/66/PV.112

General Assembly
Sixty-sixth session

Official Records

112th plenary meeting
Monday, 4 June 2012, 10 a.m.
New York

President: Mr. Al-Nasser. . . . . (Qatar)

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Agenda items 14 and 117 (*continued*)

Integrated and coordinated implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social and related fields

Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit

Report of the Secretary-General (A/66/763)

The President: It is my pleasure to welcome members to this formal plenary meeting to consider the report of the Secretary-General entitled "Follow-up to General Assembly resolution 64/291 on human security" (A/66/763).

I would like to extend my gratitude to the Secretary-General for this important report. I would also like to thank the Special Adviser on Human Security, Mr. Yukio Takasu, for his efforts in consulting widely with Member States. My thanks also go to Member States for their valuable contributions.

Concerns for human security are not new. Civilizations, past and present, have placed the survival, livelihood and dignity of their peoples at the forefront of their aspirations. Our world now, however, is becoming increasingly interconnected and major events tend to have an impact on human security within and across countries. The greatest threats facing the world today cannot be solved in isolation. We are recognizing more and more that the well-being, livelihood and dignity of people are fundamental to long-term security, peace and development.

People's aspirations are routinely frustrated and left unrealized when they are faced with sudden economic and financial crises, natural disasters and violent conflicts, as well as with other adversities such as human trafficking, health challenges and massive displacement. Those threats can also evolve into broader and more intractable crises that all too often move from the national and regional levels to become international security challenges.

The contemporary challenges facing us today are the very issues that we have at the top of our agenda in the General Assembly. As we have noted during recent deliberations on these issues, the multidimensional nature of contemporary challenges requires more holistic, integrated and sustainable solutions.

It is in that context that the United Nations can serve in addressing the broader issues surrounding human security. People's insecurities are interconnected across the three pillars of security, development and human rights. There is an urgent need to bring policies and institutions together in a far more effective way than the stand-alone or fragmented responses that we see.

Addressing human security requires that we bring together those dealing with these three pillars of the Organization to advance comprehensive and integrated solutions that are focused on people, their protection and empowerment. In that way, we can address the root causes of vulnerabilities.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

12-35742 (E)

Please recycle

Human security therefore provides a viable framework to bring our various approaches into a coherent and concerted effort that puts people at the forefront of decision-making. This dynamic and practical framework will recognize the need for differentiation based on varying contexts. It capitalizes on our comparative advantages, bringing about better targeted, better coordinated and more cost-effective responses. That calls for nationally driven solutions that are embedded in local realities. It should strengthen the capacities and resilience of Governments, communities and individuals, and, with its focus on prevention, addressing human security in this strategic manner will compel us to be proactive.

In conclusion, let me commend the work that has been done so far to advance the human security agenda. Now we must take a momentous step forward and strive to achieve consensus on a common understanding of the notion of human security and how it can best be applied to United Nations activities. That should enable us to move policies and actions towards new and more sustainable considerations and more effective international collaboration. With human security strengthened, I believe people will be able to reach their full potential, thrive in the present and build towards a future that is more peaceful and prosperous for all. I wish members fruitful deliberations.

I now give the floor to the Deputy Secretary-General, Her Excellency Ms. Asha-Rose Migiro.

The Deputy Secretary-General: It is a pleasure to join you all this morning. Thank you very much, Mr. President, for your thoughtful presentation and, indeed, for having convened this meeting.

Today we carry forward years of discussion on human security. But let us remember that human security is more than an abstract concept. For a hungry family, human security means dinner on the table. For a refugee, human security is shelter and a safe haven from the storms of conflict or disaster. For a woman caught in conflict, human security is protection from harm. For a child living in poverty, human security is the chance to go to school.

This concept goes beyond threats to physical safety. People around the world suffer abiding fears and anxiety because they lack enough food, a place to live, a job, health care, education and the freedom to live in dignity. Human security calls for people-centred, holistic actions that help Governments and communities to strengthen early warning systems about looming crises, identify the causes of insecurity and take steps to close policy gaps.

Even as we continue to work for a consensus on a common understanding of human security, there is progress on the ground.

The United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security has supported over 200 projects in 70 countries. The Fund's resources are making a measurable difference in people's lives. From rebuilding war-ravaged communities to protecting people exposed to extreme poverty, economic shocks and natural disasters, the Fund is creating change that lasts. It is responding to the complex problem of trafficking in people, arms and illicit substances, and it is helping to reduce and prevent violence in cities. I hope that the valuable lessons learned from the Trust Fund's projects can be applied to other United Nations activities around the world.

We have an important opportunity to advance the cause of human security in just over two weeks at the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development in Rio de Janeiro. The Rio+20 Conference will be a once-in-a-generation opportunity to transform ideas and aspirations into bold action for sustainable development.

The build-up to the Rio+20 Conference has already borne fruit. The themes of the Conference have generated a global debate on equity, on the green economy in the context of eradicating poverty and on the institutional framework for sustainable development.

The issues are complex, and that is reflected in the intensity of the negotiations. But we see great engagement from Governments, and we expect up to 130 heads of State and Government to attend. They will be joined by an estimated 50,000 business leaders, mayors, activists and investors. The Rio+20 Conference should provide us with a new road map for sustainable development.

One of the most important deliverables should be agreement on a process to define a set of sustainable development goals that will build on the Millennium Development Goals. The Rio+20 Conference should also provide mechanisms that stimulate our economies to create decent jobs, provide social protection to the poor and vulnerable and support a healthy environment. That will significantly advance human security. I urge the Assembly to conduct its discussions today with the goal of helping the millions of people who struggle

each day with a sense of profound insecurity, and who deserve to overcome poverty and despair and live in freedom and dignity.

The President: I thank the Deputy Secretary-General for her statement.

I now give the floor to the observer of the European Union.

Mr. Vrailas (European Union): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) and its member States. The acceding country Croatia, the candidate countries Turkey, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Iceland and Serbia, the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process, and the potential candidates Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as Ukraine, the Republic of Moldova, Armenia and Georgia, align themselves with this statement.

We thank the Secretary-General for his comprehensive report (A/66/763). We are also grateful to his Special Adviser, Ambassador Takasu, who has been championing efforts to promote the concept of human security. Work on the notion of human security has been going on since the adoption of resolution 64/291, and the report provides a very good basis from which to take stock and further advance the resolution's implementation, including in the work of the United Nations.

The European Union continues to be a strong supporter of effective multilateralism. We will continue to be closely engaged with the United Nations on issues of peace and security, in promoting universal values, human rights and democracy, in combating poverty, famine and climate change, and in protecting our environment. As part of that broad commitment, the European Union will also continue to promote human security as outlined in the Secretary-General's report: a comprehensive, integrated, people-centred and prevention-oriented approach to addressing interrelated threats to the security, livelihood and dignity of people and vulnerable communities.

The promotion of human security is one of the priorities of the EU for the sixty-sixth session of the General Assembly, and in that regard we look forward to today's debate. The three pillars of the United Nations are interdependent and should mutually reinforce one another. For instance, as we approach the landmark United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development, it is appropriate to reaffirm that sustainable development cannot be achieved without respecting and promoting democracy, human rights, the rule of law, good governance, education, the role of young people, and gender equality. The Secretary-General's report rightly recalls that human security is about linking the three pillars through the protection and empowerment of the individual. Putting it in different terms, it is the protection and empowerment of individuals that ultimately forms the basis for achieving stability, sustainable development and human rights.

Respect for all human rights and the rule of law should remain at the core of any application of the human security approach. Human rights should be mainstreamed and integrated into all aspects of the work of the United Nations, including that of human security. In addition, as underlined by the Secretary-General, when ensuring the survival, livelihood and dignity of all individuals, which is what human security is about, special focus should be placed on the most vulnerable populations and groups, as well as on fragile States. Promoting the rights of those in vulnerable situations is, in that regard, a key concern. It includes ensuring the representation of vulnerable groups in decision-making, as well as their improved access to justice, services, work and social opportunities. Those are issues that need our full attention, and the human security approach should enhance our ability to work even harder to reach those goals.

Building on those principles, the European Union supports a pragmatic approach aimed at focusing on priority areas of United Nations work where human security can best show its added value. The common understanding proposed by the Secretary-General is very useful in that regard, particularly in defining the boundaries of the human security concept, anticipating and avoiding possible misinterpretation of its scope or interference with other approaches, and establishing a foundation for progress in its implementation. We believe that a common understanding on human security is not an end in itself but a means to advance the implementation of the concept of human security in United Nations activities at the field level in a coherent and non-duplicative manner.

With regard to areas of United Nations work where the human security approach could be applied, the European Union notes with appreciation the Secretary-General's non-exhaustive list of proposals. We understand security in a broad, holistic manner. Indeed,

preventing threats from becoming sources of conflict early on is at the heart of our approach to security. We therefore believe that human security in peacebuilding should also include the conflict-prevention dimension, which implies building strong civil societies, developing early-warning systems, providing mediation and advancing gender empowerment. Special attention should also be paid to countries' post-conflict threats, focusing on areas ranging from reconciliation services to mine clearance, depending on the country's needs.

The pursuit of the Millennium Development Goals, particularly in ensuring food and nutrition security for the estimated 1 billion people suffering from chronic hunger, remains a major concern and key priority for the European Union. Other areas of work are also worth exploring, including those where the potential for enhanced cross-regional cooperation exists, such as in attention to vulnerable groups, persons with disabilities or the protection of women and children, including situations of armed conflict.

Those are just a few basic considerations that the European Union would like to share as a reaction to the Secretary-General's report. Similarly, we believe those considerations leave room for accommodating different interpretations and ways to implement the concept of human security. Rest assured that the European Union will actively engage in the General Assembly with a view to reaching an agreement on elements of a common understanding on human security. As underlined by the Secretary-General, the application of the concept of human security should not bring additional layers to the work of the United Nations. In line with a pragmatic and action-oriented approach, it will be important to extract lessons and best practices from existing projects in the field. We welcome the fact that, as the Secretary-General's report mentions, more than 200 projects have been carried out through the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security. We look forward to illustrative examples and further information in that regard.

Prince Zeid Ra'ad Zeid Al-Hussein (Jordan): It is my honour to speak on behalf of the Human Security Network, which includes Austria, Chile, Costa Rica, Greece, Ireland, Mali, Norway, Panama, Slovenia, Switzerland, Thailand and South Africa as an observer, as well as my own country, Jordan. The Human Security Network is an informal group of States that advocates a people-centred, holistic approach to security that complements the more traditional understanding of national and international security.

At the outset, I wish to thank the Secretary-General for his valuable support in this important field. The Human Security Network would also like to take this opportunity to thank the Special Adviser of the Secretary-General for Human Security, Ambassador Takasu, for his outstanding work in recent years and for his convening of open and inclusive consultations on human security last November.

The Human Security Network welcomes the report (A/66/763) on human security, which, for the first time, includes a common understanding on human security. We commend that approach since we find the notion of human security better described as a number of agreed parameters rather than a precise definition. What counts for us is that within that common understanding the three pillars of human security, namely, peace and security, human rights and development, receive equal attention. At the centre of attention of human security is the human being. The focus of the notion is on the protection of individuals from critical and pervasive threats to their physical and psychological safety, dignity and well-being. Special attention should be paid to vulnerable groups, including persons with disabilities and women and children.

Threats to human security are often complex and highly interrelated. They force us to revise our traditional notions of security. Depending on the particular national context, some threats are perceived as more important than others. For that reason, the human security network is of the view that there should be no general prioritization of certain threats over others and, in that sense, supports the notion contained in the report of a non-exhaustive list of threats. Prioritizing only certain areas would mean conceiving of threats as separate and independent problems, whereas in reality they are interconnected and often mutually reinforcing.

What further qualifies threats as human security threats is that they are critical and pervasive. By "critical", we mean that they threaten to cut into the core activities and functions of human lives. Threats to human security are also pervasive in that they are large-scale and widespread. As an illustration, in our collective experience such threats have included environmental pollution, natural and man-made disasters, armed conflicts and their impact on civilians and the peacebuilding efforts in their aftermath,

challenges to ensuring food and nutrition security, health, the impact of financial and economic crises, and the violation of human rights and fundamental freedoms. We believe that threats to human security should be prevented from becoming sources of conflict early on. Peacebuilding should therefore include a conflict-prevention dimension, which implies building strong and prosperous communities and vibrant civil societies, developing early-warning systems, promoting national reconciliation and strengthening capacities for peaceful mediation and advancing gender empowerment and the equal participation of women in decision-making processes. Special attention should also be paid to countries' post-conflict threats, focusing on areas ranging from reconciliation services to mine clearance, depending on the countries' needs.

The State is often the main, yet not the sole, contributor to human security. That is so for mainly two reasons. First, many threats cannot be addressed at the national level only. Secondly, in some instances, States can constitute the main threat to people's security. Therefore, the realization of human security may not involve only Governments; it may involve contributions from a broader range of different actors, such as civil society networks, regional and international organizations, non-governmental organizations, local communities and the private sector. As such, human security complements the traditional notion of security and serves as a unifying concept that bridges notions of security at all levels, from the individual and/or the local, that is, human, security, to the national, that is, State security, and to the global, that is, the international security levels.

As members of the Network, we share a common and deep commitment to human security, but we also encourage each member of the Network to freely prioritize the topics it is most concerned with. We think that the same should apply to all Member States. Human security, above all, should guide the United Nations as a whole. As such, in the pursuit of human security, the United Nations approach should not be one of prioritizing single fields of activities over others. Indeed, at the end of the day, helping people on the ground is what really matters. In that respect, we welcome projects carried out by the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security. Improvements in human security directly impact people's daily lives for the better. Any debate about the common understanding of human security should not divert our attention from taking action to improve human security for people all over the world.

Finally, let me also take the opportunity to announce the preparation of a new draft resolution on human security and on the Human Security Network. More precisely, Jordan, as the group's Chair, will co-facilitate the negotiations together with Japan. We foresee the beginning of that exercise shortly after today's debate.

Mr. Sammis (United States of America): The United States welcomes the report (A/66/763) of the Secretary-General on human security and would like to thank you, Mr. President, for organizing today's debate.

The concept of human security reflects the fundamental values of the United States, including the four essential freedoms that President Franklin Roosevelt laid out in his 1941 State of the Union address — freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want and freedom from fear. The United States believes that human security, which is based on the dignity and empowerment of the individual, provides a valuable framework for promoting global progress and development, including, in particular, the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. In that regard, we welcome the emphasis in the Secretary-General's most recent report on the fact that human security connects security, development and human rights. We agree with the Secretary-General's view that human security

> "is based on the fundamental understanding that Governments retain the primary role for ensuring the survival, livelihood and dignity of their citizens" (*A/66/763, para. 2*).

Our focus moving forward should be on what Governments can do to translate the notion of human security into actions to promote the well-being and security of their citizens. The success of those efforts will depend, to a large extent, on Governments safeguarding the political and economic freedoms that their citizens enjoy. When all men, women and children live freely and are empowered to achieve their full potential, it is not only the individuals who prosper but their nations as well. In that way, human security and national security are inextricably linked, with each ensuring the realization of the other.

The United States looks forward to working with delegations to further develop our common understanding on human security, including in the upcoming draft resolution that was just announced. We should seek out ways that human security can be advanced within the United Nations system in support of initiatives to

protect people, including from such threats as poverty, disease, hunger, environmental degradation and social exclusion, all of which can endanger civil society, Government legitimacy and economic prosperity.

Mr. Khalil (Egypt): It is a special pleasure for me to be here today to deliver my first statement before the General Assembly in my new capacity as the Permanent Representative of Egypt to the United Nations on the important topic of human security, with you, Sir, presiding over this body. I would like first to express our appreciation to you, Mr. President, for convening today's plenary meeting to consider the report (A/66/763) of the Secretary-General on the follow-up to resolution 64/291, on human security.

I would like to thank the Secretary-General for his comprehensive and well-balanced report, which identifies the main features of the concept of human security as has been discussed and commented upon by Member States. It takes into account the reservations of many Member States regarding the possible definition, scope and use, or, to be more precise, misuse, of this concept.

The report reaffirms that the human security approach should not entail the use or threat of use of force, that it should be implemented with full respect for the principles of the United Nations Charter, especially respect for the sovereignty of States and for their territorial integrity and the non-interference in matters that are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of States. It also clarifies that the notion of human security is distinct from the responsibility to protect, both theoretically and implementation-wise. It recognizes as well that Governments retain the primary responsibility for achieving the security, development and human rights parameters of human security for their own people and that the international community may complement those efforts upon the request and with the consent of the Governments concerned.

We have to recognize that the prolonged discussion on the concept of human security over the past several years did not question the value of the concept itself. Rather, it reflected a suspicion that it might be used to justify unwanted intervention in vulnerable countries for political reasons, irrespective of the real needs and priorities of their peoples and at the expense of their social and political stability.

The Secretary-General's report (A/66/763) was decisive in addressing head-on most of those suspicions. It took an unequivocal position towards them. The areas of activities where the human security approach can be useful to the work of the Organization underlined in this report, namely, climate change, post-conflict peacebuilding, the global financial crisis and health-related challenges to the Millennium Development Goals, were quite inspiring in the sense that they provided practical examples of activities that are least controversial and do not provide much room for the suspected possibilities of misuse.

That brings me to a concrete suggestion in order to advance our work and provide the necessary assurances to prevent the human security approach from being abused for political or other purposes. The next phase of this discussion should focus on the modalities for the application of the human security approach in the work of the United Nations. Those modalities should include the following: the application of this approach should always be considered in the General Assembly, where all the members would have the right to participate in the decision-making process, and not in the Security Council; it should by no means include the use or threat of use of force; it should be considered only upon the request and with the consent of the States concerned; finally, it should be decided upon by consensus, if not unanimity. Those simple safeguards would contribute to unlocking the debate on the adequacy of the human security approach. They would provide the necessary safeguards against the future abuse of that concept and clear the way for its good use for the benefit of all Member States.

Mrs. Navarro Barro (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): First and foremost, we would like to express our gratitude for the convening of today's meeting and for the report of the Secretary-General (A/66/763) on this important topic. In our view, this document is a well-prepared report that strikes a better balance between the views of States Members on this subject as compared to prior reports. Furthermore, it brings together the elements that should necessarily be included in a definition of human security.

It is necessary to recall that what has been agreed to date by Member States with regard to this topic is reflected in paragraph 143 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1) and in resolution 64/291. Those documents refer to the need for developing and agreeing on a concept or definition of human security.

Notwithstanding that, the report before us does not include a proposal for a concept or a definition of human security; rather, it puts forth a proposal for a so-called common understanding. In our view, there is a huge difference between the two approaches, given that a common understanding would be a broader and more ambiguous approach and would have practical implications, since having an agreement on this might lead to arduous discussions with a view to including all positions on the matter of human security.

Allow me to reiterate the main elements of our position with regard to human security. In that regard, we would like to underscore the fact that the concept should comply with the following requirements: it should be distinct from the responsibility to protect and its implementation; it should not entail the threat or the use of force; it should be implemented with full and complete respect for the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, including full respect for the sovereignty of States, their territorial integrity and non-interference in matters that are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of States. It should not entail additional legal obligations on the part of States. It should include the recognition of economic, social and cultural rights. It should recognize that political, economic, social and cultural conditions vary significantly from one country to another and, therefore, it is the countries themselves that should design and implement their responses in accordance with their conditions.

In our judgement, as we have stated in the past, the main global threats to human security are the arms race and the danger of a nuclear war, climate change and the persistence of an unfair and dysfunctional economic world order. There can be no human security without sustainable develeopment. While there is food insecurity and energy insecurity, there will be no human security. Serious problems such as global warming, the danger of a rise in sea levels, the exhaustion of fossil fuels and the irrational use of water and energy sources, among others, are just a few of the very serious threats to human security. There can be no human security until nuclear disarmament is achieved and while the major Powers continue spending much more on producing arms than on saving lives. Nor will there be human security if we do not end the selectivity, partiality and double standards in the area of human rights; if we ignore economic, social and cultural rights; and if we do not promote the right to development as a priority for countries of the South.

Mr. Körösi (Hungary), Vice-President, took the Chair.

Finally, allow me to reiterate the importance of the decision-making process, with regard to this issue, which should take place in the context of the General Assembly in an open and transparent manner, without any unnecessary demands or pressure. On the contrary, a careful and in-depth analysis that takes into account the legitimate interests and concerns of all Member States should prevail at all times. Only in that way will we be able to achieve a consensus-based satisfactory agreement for one and all.

Mrs. Morgan (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): At the outset, I would like to thank the President of the General Assembly for convening this formal debate, where Member States have an opportunity to present considerations relative to the report of the Secretary-General on human security (A/66/763).

On the basis of what is set out in the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1), various debates have been held and specific initiatives have been launched, which has led to a better understanding of the concept. The report of the Secretary-General that we are considering today resolutely contributes to achieving such an objective owing not only to its content, but also to the broad consultation and dialogue process with States that the Special Adviser on Human Security undertook in drawing it up, pursuant to resolution 64/291.

The Secretary-General's report describes the focus of human security and the practical value that it provides. Clear outlining of its characteristics also makes it possible to avoid its confusion with other concepts or unnecessary attempts to broaden its scope. That is why we agree with the Secretary-General that human security does not entail new legal obligations for States, but rather has a practical, cross-cutting, complementary and multidimensional purpose.

Mexico sees three added values in human security. The first is that the implementation of the concept enables Member States to incorporate various dimensions in the decisions that they take in order to meet their obligations towards individuals. In that regard, it is a relevant approach for decision-making. Secondly, it becomes a catalyst for the three pillars of the Charter — development, security and human rights. That enhances its multidimensional nature. The third added value is the priority that it gives to the empowerment

of individuals and communities in preventing threats to their security.

The report of the Secretary-General affirms that there is no human security without the security of States, and vice versa. Mexico believes that achieving human security simultaneously strengthens the security of the State and that there is no gap between them, but that, on the contrary, they are mutually enhancing. Mexico agrees that human security is not a topic exclusively for developing countries, since people throughout the world may face various conditions of insecurity and, thus, their protection and empowerment are the basis for them to live with dignity and, in broader terms, to achieve conditions of stability and development.

That is a preventative approach that enables us to work for the most vulnerable groups by focusing on structural elements that promote such a position from a standpoint of human rights, development and security, while fully respecting the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

My delegation supports the report's recommendations. We hope that, in the follow-up to this debate, all States will reach a common understanding of the concept that gives rise to practical measures in support of people throughout the world.

Finally, I would like to point out my delegation's support for the important activities that the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security has developed over the years. We are certain that the broad understanding of the concept of human security that we are building will enhance the actions of the United Nations, regional bodies, States and other actors seeking to protect and empower the individual still further.

Mr. De Las Ovalles Colmenares (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation remains cautious about implementing the human security concept since, among other things, there is still no consensus on its definition: whom it seeks to protect, what values it aims to promote, what the nature of the threat is, what the sources of insecurity are and what means should be used to tackle the threats in question.

My delegation recognizes the innovative contribution of the 1994 report on human security of the United Nations Development Programme, and shares the position that development policies should focus on the well-being of individuals and communities, not simply on macroeconomic indicators. We also share the view that among the threats to the security of people and communities is an unequal world, in which some States and elites have disproportionate power, which they wield to the detriment of the rest.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela believes that the implementation of a human security programme should be grounded in development, not weapons, and that it is possible to achieve human security only if society's patterns of income, consumption and lifestyles are restructured, all military bases are closed, military aid is changed into economic support and arms export subsidies are eliminated. It is possible only if fair access to global markets is ensured for poor countries, the tariff barriers imposed by developed countries are removed and the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the United Nations are restructured. My delegation recognizes the emphasis that the report of the Secretary-General (A/66/763) gives to areas such as climate change, health care and social security policies, but warns that such matters can be fully addressed only if the fundamental causes for the lack of human security in the world are recognized.

As the Secretary-General's report acknowledges, the concept of human security should be placed within the framework of the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and international law, in particular, non-interference in the internal affairs of States, the legitimate right to self-defence and State sovereignty.

The concept of human security must under no circumstance serve as a Trojan horse for topics that come under the jurisdiction of the General Assembly to be included on the agenda of the Security Council, that is to say, that they be "securitized". The human security agenda must focus on development and, as such, should be under the purview of the General Assembly.

Mr. Nishida (Japan): First of all, I would like to thank the President of the General Assembly, His Excellency Mr. Nassir Abdulaziz Al-Nasser, for the initiative he has taken in organizing today's formal debate on human security in a plenary meeting of the Assembly. Allow me also express my Government's deep gratitude to the Secretary-General for his report (A/66/763).

Since the adoption of the first resolution on human security in 2010 (resolution 64/291), Member States have engaged in further elaborating the notion of human security and forming a common understanding of it. The

informal debate hosted by the President of the General Assembly in April 2011 contributed to our deliberations on the concept of human security. Following that debate, the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on Human Security invited all Member States to provide their views through written submissions and informal consultations. That open and transparent process, together with the contributions of Member States, resulted in an excellent report from the Secretary-General that provides a useful basis for today's debate.

Mr. President, I would like to draw your particular attention to the following points addressed in the Secretary-General's report. First, the report provides us with a clear and comprehensive picture of human security by illustrating the course of discussions on the concept, its core values and its scope. As a result, the report presents a common understanding on human security based on the views expressed by Member States. My delegation believes that that common understanding is an excellent basis for further promoting human security in the activities of the United Nations, Member States and regional and international organizations.

Secondly, the report indicates that Governments retain the primary role in ensuring the survival, livelihood and dignity of their populations. In that regard, it is the view of my delegation that human security is a tool for assisting Governments in identifying widespread and cross-cutting threats to the prosperity of their peoples and the stability of their sovereignty, by emphasizing the interlinkages among the three pillars of the United Nations system, namely, peace and security, development and human rights.

Thirdly, my delegation takes note with great interest that the report articulates that

> "Human security does not entail the threat or the use of force and is implemented with full respect for the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations" (*A/66/763, para. 22*).

My delegation would like to stress that potential misinterpretation or misuse of human security should be avoided in its application. Furthermore, the report makes a clear distinction when describing the differences between human security and the responsibility to protect, in line with the separate provisions in the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1).

The concept of human security is already being applied to policies and measures carried out both at national and regional levels. Indeed, major regional and subregional organizations across the globe, including the African Union, the Economic Community of West African States, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation and the Organization of American States, have adopted the concept. Various United Nations agencies, including the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and UNESCO, have not only incorporated human security into their own strategies but also actively disseminate the concept throughout the countries and regions where they work. Japan believes that the General Assembly should encourage those initiatives to further mainstream and make operational the concept at the various levels, in particular throughout the activities of the United Nations.

Additionally, the critical nature of the role of the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security cannot be stressed enough in the light of its contribution to producing tangible results on the ground through the operational activities of United Nations agencies. Since its establishment, in 1999, more than 200 projects have been implemented in 70 countries in all regions, in close cooperation with implementing agencies such as UNDP, UNICEF and the United Nations Population Fund. Japan hopes that the Trust Fund's activities will be further enhanced through contributions from as many Member States as possible. To that end, the Government of Japan would like to announce here a new contribution of $10 million to the Fund. My delegation would like to invite other Member States to make voluntary contributions to the Fund as well.

In order to take further steps based on the report, Japan, together with other like-minded countries, would like to propose the adoption of a new draft resolution in order to agree on a common understanding and further promote human security. Member States are invited to participate in a forthcoming informal consultation on that draft resolution, which will be co-facilitated by Japan and Jordan, the Chair of the Human Security Network. My delegation would like to conduct the consultation in a constructive and transparent manner and would like to see the adoption of a resolution with the understanding and support of Member States.

Finally, my Government expresses its sincere appreciation to all the delegations participating in today's meeting for their engagement in, and valuable contribution to, the debate on human security based on the report of the Secretary-General. I strongly hope

that today's meeting marks a step forward in our shared efforts to further promote human security in order to address pressing global issues within the activities of the United Nations.

Mr. White (Australia): I thank the Deputy Secretary-General for her remarks earlier.

Comprehensive, integrated and people-centred approaches to global policy challenges are becoming more important than ever as challenges increase in complexity and diversify in nature. Protecting and empowering populations is essential to shaping long-term, effective and sustainable responses because it builds capacity, understanding and resilience among individuals and communities. We need to ensure that our collective actions are not fragmented, that they focus on prevention and that they directly benefit affected populations. The human security concept provides a normative framework to do just that, which is why Australia supports it.

Many of us have grappled with how to define the concept of human security, but the Ambassador of Nauru stripped away the apparent complexities when speaking on behalf of the Pacific small island developing States at the 2010 General Assembly debate on human security (see A/64/PV.88), clearly stating what human security meant for small States, which represent many of the most vulnerable nations and peoples. Small island communities grapple with the simultaneous threats of sea-level rise, extreme weather events, the decline in the viability of fisheries, changes to traditional patterns of subsistence agriculture and consequent pressures on intercommunal relations. For small island communities, the interconnectedness of security threats needs no explanation. The need for a comprehensive approach in order to ensure the ongoing security of such populations is clear. Human security provides an effective framework for that response.

Many of us are already placing the human security concept at the core of our actions on multidimensional threats to security, even if we do not always label it as such. Our collective actions for combating food insecurity, for example, recognize the intersections between the root causes of conflict, the effects of drought, famine and population growth, the impact of higher food prices and higher volatility on vulnerable populations, the ongoing distortions of world food markets, and additional factors such as climate change and scarce water resources. They recognize the universality of freedom from fear, freedom from want and freedom to live in dignity. Our actions on food security also recognize the need for multidimensional and context-specific responses. That is effectively the human security concept in practice. Commonwealth leaders, whose populations represent half the world's hungry, recognized the nexus between factors affecting global food insecurity and the need for more robust mitigation and prevention efforts when they adopted the 2011 Perth Declaration on Food Security Principles. Viable action on food security will increasingly rely on such an approach.

An essential aspect of human security is enabling citizens to live with dignity and without fear of physical harm. In developing that concept, we must take into account local security challenges and integrate strategies to address them. For that reason, Australia considers humanitarian and security programmes for combating landmines and small arms and light weapons to be essential parts of development. Australia, including in its role as Chair of the Mine Action Support Group, will continue to promote action aimed at clearing unexploded ordnance, so that people can go about their daily lives, going to market, work and school. I would like to recall the contribution that Uganda, Jordan and Guinea-Bissau have made to the security of their own people by becoming landmine-free this year. Australia will also strongly advocate for the adoption in July of an ambitious arms trade treaty with terms covering small arms and ammunition.

We welcome the Secretary-General's report (A/66/763) and thank him and his Special Adviser, Ambassador Takasu, for their work as part of the broader effort to apply the concept of human security to the work of the United Nations. We support the concept of human security as set out in the report. It provides the clarity that many Member States have been seeking. We particularly welcome the focus on the interconnectedness of peace, development and human rights. We also support efforts to introduce a substantive draft resolution on human security during the current session of the General Assembly. The report provides insightful analysis of how a human security approach could benefit the work of the United Nations. It is important that Member States provide the necessary support for operationalizing that.

In conclusion, and as the Deputy Secretary-General remarked this morning, it is appropriate and timely that we are considering human security just weeks before the landmark United Nations Conference on Sustainable

Development (Rio+20). Many of the challenges relating to human security will be addressed at Rio+20, including the sustainable management of oceans, strengthened food security and disaster risk reduction. Improved human security in areas such as those will have a major impact on support for sustainable development, particularly for those who face unique vulnerabilities, especially women and girls. The goals of Australia's aid policy all go to the heart of promoting human security, because human security is a fundamental development issue. Given the contemporary relevance of the human security concept, we hope that today's discussions will serve to take this agenda forward.

Mr. Seger (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): Switzerland would like to associate itself with the statement delivered on behalf of the Human Security Network, of which we are a member.

Switzerland looks forward to the forthcoming negotiations on human security. The Secretary-General's report (A/66/763) provides an excellent basis for those negotiations, and we would like to thank its authors.

Traditionally, the concepts of State and security have been closely linked. Security is aimed first and foremost at the protection of the nation State and its institutions from threats, domestic and foreign. As a consequence, State authorities have a monopoly on the use of force. The State is not, however, an abstract entity that can be dissociated from its population, and security cannot be limited to the protection of the State alone. That is why the concept of human security is important. We view human security as a different perspective on or approach to security, centred on the individual, in contrast to the classic approach, centred on the State. Those two approaches are complementary rather than opposed. In matters of human security the accent should be on protecting individuals from serious, systematic threats that harm their physical and psychological safety, dignity and well-being.

The question of what people should be protected from, how and by whom depends greatly on the context. We would discourage any formulation attempting a precise scientific or legal definition of the concept of security, which would ultimately limit its intrinsic usefulness. We favour the approach in the Secretary-General's report, which proposes a common understanding rather than a definition of the notion. A common understanding, we believe, is the best way the General Assembly can hope to reach a successful agreement on human security. What matters to us is that the three pillars of human security — peace and security, human rights and development — receive equal attention. Furthermore, we advise against giving priority to certain United Nations areas of activity as human security activities. Member States should be free to prioritize the subjects that most concern them. Human security is a guiding concept that should guide the United Nations as a whole.

Debates on human security should not lead us to forget that actions at the national and international levels must be undertaken on behalf of those people whose existence, dignity and fundamental rights are threatened. Improvements in human security have a direct effect on the lives of those concerned. Ultimately, what really matters is helping the people on the ground.

Mr. Maksimychev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The Russian delegation has studied the Secretary-General's report on human security (A/66/763) and thanks him for preparing it. Resolution 64/291 clearly reflects a general understanding of the main challenge that Member States face: achieving agreement in the Assembly on how to define human security. That is the aim and basic mandate contained in paragraph 143 of the Outcome Document of the 2005 World Summit (resolution 60/1). The Secretary-General's report provides a pretty good basis for our further work, and Russia is ready to contribute constructively to it. We would particularly like to stress that defining human security must be the result of a consensus among Member States. Only in that way will it be possible to talk about measures to be taken to advance that concept in the work of the United Nations.

We are firmly of the view that the main task in applying the concept is to ensure that there is harmonized development of the human potential in the socio-economic sphere. In other words, human security is quite simply a people-centred approach to responding to development challenges and to ensuring sustainable human development. In Russia's view, the priority in its application could be issues that are clearly high on the international agenda, such as mitigating natural and man-made disasters and responding to global health challenges. However, the discussion on areas of implementation of the concept should take place once we have agreed on a definition of human security and should be on the basis of that definition. Such a definition should be as clear and understandable as possible and leave as little room for ambiguity or interpretation as it

can. In that context, the word definition would be much more appropriate than a common understanding.

In that regard, allow me once again to reaffirm the following principles in Russia's approach to the issue. The concept should be used only within the context of international law and in line with the principle of the non-use of force or the threat of the use of force, pursuant to the provisions of the United Nations Charter, non-interference in internal affairs and respect for national sovereignty. The primary role in applying the concept of human security lies with Governments, which have the primary responsibility, and no one else, for ensuring the security of the citizens in their countries. They should define the challenges that, under specific national conditions, prevent ensuring the survival, well-being and dignified life of the people in their country. National ownership is the main principle in applying the concept.

The role of the international community is to provide Governments, at their request and with their agreement, with the necessary support in terms of capacity-building to overcome existing challenges. It is unacceptable when external actors and coalitions impose the system of the United Nations, or the entire international community, or their view of existing threats to human security on any particular country. Russia supports a strong position against a selective and politicized approach to applying the human security concept.

The concept of human security is in no way linked to the responsibility to protect or its implementation. The human security concept should be in line with the existing conceptual basis for international cooperation, including in the areas of sustainable development, human rights and so on. Actions under the flag of human security are carried out under the central role of the United Nations and should not duplicate or replace those of existing bodies — such as the Security Council, the Human Rights Council, the Economic and Social Council — or that of environmental law and other conventions. Furthermore, applying the concept should not be seen as a reason for "securitizing" the United Nations agenda.

We believe that such principled approaches should provide the basis for all further discussions to agree on a definition of human security. We note that many of them are reflected in the report of the Secretary-General, in particular in section VII, which provides a common understanding of human security. We are ready to contribute to a substantial discussion of that section. We believe that that is necessary and see it as the only way forward.

Ms. Hosking (South Africa): I would like to thank the President of the General Assembly for convening today's plenary meeting, and the Secretary-General for the submission of his report (A/66/763). We would also like to thank the Deputy Secretary-General for her remarks. South Africa furthermore commends Ambassador Takasu, Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on Human Security, for his commendable work on the issue over the past several years.

The Secretary-General's report and today's meeting form the basis for further discussions on the issue of human security. With regard to the report, we are pleased to note the emphasis placed on the core pillars of peace, development and human rights. We also recognize the primacy of the State in ensuring the human security of all its citizens. We recognize that the concept of human security has moved beyond its initial narrow understanding of the security of the State, to incorporate a broader understanding that also recognizes political, economic, food, health and environmental security, as well as the security of the individual, communities and others.

The debate on human security should be consistent with paragraph 143 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1), which stresses the right of people to live in freedom and dignity, free from poverty and despair. Today's discussions underscore the importance of the Secretary-General's report, in which the General Assembly, among others, is requested to agree upon a common understanding on human security.

Member States have expressed different views on the notion of human security. It has become clear that it will be necessary to continue discussions towards arriving at a common understanding of the concept. South Africa also supports the inclusion of academia and civil society in such discussions.

My delegation subscribes to the notion that human security measures should assist the global South, especially Africa, to realize sustainable development and human security through the creation of conditions that enable communities to live free and secure lives, in which their fundamental human rights are protected and where they are guaranteed access to health care, education and food, as well as an environment free of poverty and exploitation. In that regard, we are pleased to

note that the concept of human security finds resonance in the African Union common defence strategy.

My delegation believes that human security should address the following issues: poverty eradication in its broadest sense and in terms of achieving the Millennium Development Goals; underdevelopment and the prevention of the increasing marginalization of many in the developing world as a result of the unequal benefits of globalization; and the prevention and eradication of communicable diseases such as HIV and AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria, as well as infectious diseases.

Indeed, there is a direct correlation between insecurity and denying persons the right of access to resources. Undoubtedly, recent global developments have strongly underlined the urgent need for a renewed focus by the international community on finding appropriate responses and remedies to the challenges posed by the ongoing mass unemployment, in particular youth unemployment. In the absence of fair and equitable access to resources and opportunity, the prospects for achieving people-centred development will be compromised.

The notion of human security is of particular relevance to the African continent. It has a direct impact on sustainable development and, therefore, also impacts on Africa's peace, security and stability. In that regard, key African Union institutions, such as the Pan-African Parliament, the Peace and Security Council and the New Partnership for Africa's Development, strongly underscore Africa's commitment to human security. The establishment of those institutions is a tangible demonstration of the strong commitment of Africa's leadership to promoting human security as a core element in effectively addressing the challenges that Africa faces. Furthermore, all regional initiatives must, by necessity, recognize the centrality of the United Nations, the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

In conclusion, the projects funded by the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security are to be commended. South Africa is the beneficiary of two Trust Fund projects.

My delegation will commit itself to discussing and defining the notion of human security with a view to reaching a common understanding of the concept. South Africa remains ready to engage constructively in further discussions on the issue.

Mr. Ulibarri (Costa Rica) (*spoke in Spanish*): Costa Rica is pleased to associate itself with the statement made by the Permanent Representative and Ambassador of Jordan on behalf of the Human Security Network.

We would like to reiterate our appreciation for the report of the Secretary-General (A/66/763), which, we believe, will serve as a very good basis for future action by the Organization in that area. We would like to make some additional observations in our national capacity.

Today's discussion, as well as our follow-up to everything that is related to human security, should always take into account the fact that there is already agreement in the international community on the main elements relating to the concept of human security. That agreement forms part of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1). I would like to mention some of those elements.

First, it is clear that the common understanding on human security reached at the 2005 Summit is centred on the individual, in particular the most vulnerable who need particular attention. The people-centred approach, in turn, is not inappropriate to the language and action of the Organization, since it stems from the very Preamble of the United Nations Charter, which posits individuals, or the peoples of the United Nations, as its source of primary legitimacy.

Secondly, we must reiterate the importance of the three United Nations pillars on human security, as paragraph 143 of the 2005 Summit Outcome highlights them in a balanced way and underscores the right of individuals to live freely in dignity, unshackled by poverty and misery. In other words, the pillars of human rights, development and security are all relevant to this discussion.

Thirdly, the Summit Outcome acknowledges that all people, in particular the most vulnerable, should have equal opportunities to enjoy all their rights and to fully develop their human potential. That implies a notion of persons as free beings, capable of taking autonomous decisions, as well as an emphasis on the importance of empowerment in order to exercise such capacities. We therefore believe in the indispensable link between personal freedom and human security.

Human security is progress, which, at the same time, complements and outlines the traditional model of security, That model focused on the State under a reasoning of public order and national defence, which,

at its most extreme, was used to justify repression. We recall how the so-called doctrine of national security was used by many past Latin American dictators in order to justify their arbitrariness. The same thing is now happening in other parts of the world; hence, the importance of giving human security the proper dimension.

As the Secretary-General's report points out, there is a close link between security, development and human rights. They are all interrelated. Threats to the basic right to live in dignity, free from fear and poverty, are multidimensional and should be addressed holistically with particular emphasis on the human aspect of issues and their root causes.

For Costa Rica, that new understanding of a people-centred security means that any consideration of human security should include human rights, international humanitarian law and development aspects. However, that in no way legitimizes the discussion of human rights or development and the exercise of such rights as issues of national security and public order. On the contrary — and allow me to use a neologism — such "securitization" of the concept of human security is a threat that must be avoided since it could lead to effects similar to those that we would wish to avoid in the new people-centred security model. Our ultimate objective, noted in the 2005 Summit Outcome and rooted in the United Nations Charter, is to protect people and, through an appropriate balance among security, development and human rights, not to undermine or limit people's dignity and well-being, including their survival, in the name of State security.

States have the responsibility to guarantee peoples' security, understood in its broadest sense. Moreover, in our interdependent world, other public and private organizations, including civil society and national, regional and international bodies, are also key actors in the area of human security. We must protect them and welcome their work. We must recognize that various States and entities, even the Organization, have in practice been long making significant contributions to human security.

The Secretary-General's report sets out a number of examples of areas of United Nations activity in which an approach to human security could be useful. Some such areas that our country believes would be of the greatest added value in that conceptual context are the following: mediation and conflict prevention; peacekeeping and peacebuilding; the protection of civilians; reducing environmental deterioration, climate change and natural disasters; promoting the rule of law and preventing violations of fundamental rights; and preventing and combating organized transnational crime.

Finally, allow me to state that, as also noted on behalf of the Human Security Network, above and beyond the great progress that we have made in terms of a common understanding on the basic elements of the concept, the most important thing is to continue undertaking specific actions to promote the security of people on the ground. Neither the 2005 World Summit Outcome nor resolution 64/291 limit action in that area to the strict or legal definition of the concept of human security. Efforts to reach common understandings on the matter should be seen as a guide so as to provide greater consistency to and enhance action on human security within and outside the Organization. It should not be used to hinder it or use it as an excuse for us to plunge into paralysis.

Mr. Manjeev Singh Puri (India): Allow me to begin by thanking all previous speakers for their presentations and useful insight on the concept of human security and on how to work forward to define the conceptual framework and move towards its implementation. In that regard, I would like to thank the Secretary-General for his comprehensive report on human security (A/66/763). We also wish to recognize the contribution of the Japanese delegation in pursuing this debate at the United Nations.

While the idea of human security appears obvious and is well captured in paragraph 143 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome document (resolution 60/1) as freedom from fear, freedom from want and the right to live with dignity for all individuals in order to fully develop their potential, it is important that we situate that in a conceptual framework in the multilateral context. The discussions about the conceptual framework for human security have been long and drawn out. That is not surprising, since human security issues and related threats and vulnerabilities naturally vary from one situation to another. We therefore look at the human security framework as one that guides our response to challenges confronting us, rather than as a policy goal in itself.

We have, however, made significant progress. We have taken note of the common understanding of human security outlined in paragraph 36 of the

Secretary-General's report. It provides a good basis for carrying forward our discussions towards an accepted and clearly articulated common understanding on human security. In fact, India has stressed many of those elements in our statements on the subject in the past. Today's deliberations and discussions on the new draft resolution on human security will no doubt help further refine that understanding.

Human security encompasses the interlinkages between peace, development and human rights. The common understanding of the issue needs to recognize that the primary responsibility for human security rests with States and their Governments. Governments retain the primary role for ensuring the survival, livelihood and dignity of their citizens. The notion of human security is distinct from the responsibility to protect and its implementation. The concept of human security must avoid the "securitization" of economic and social discourse and concentrate on capacity-building and the empowerment of people. The concept must be people-centric and should go beyond the narrow framework of the protection of populations from physical security threats like war and conflict to a much broader framework to encompass multidimensional and comprehensive parameters, with development as the central pillar. It is evident that the absence of development and growth would adversely affect freedom from want and freedom from fear. From our perspective, the idea of human security needs to eschew the idea of the interventionist approach. The understanding of human security needs to be clearly anchored within the framework of the United Nations Charter and in principles of State sovereignty, which are the bedrock of international relations.

The report of the Secretary-General also identifies four areas where human security can bring particular added value to the work of the United Nations, areas that include climate change, post-conflict peacebuilding, the global financial and economic crisis, the Millennium Development Goals and health and related challenges. Some of those areas have cross-cutting linkages as well. Of course, the identified areas, which are by no means exhaustive, encompass challenges that are not necessarily confined within national boundaries.

We also live in a world that has a fair degree of globalization. We are cognizant of the complexity associated with the concept and its multidimensional linkages at the national, regional and international levels. Therefore, it is imperative to stress the need for genuine international cooperation.

The responsibility of the international community is to complement and provide the necessary support to Governments, upon their request, to strengthen their capacities and respond to current threats and challenges. Such international cooperation must recognize the inherent constraints that many developing countries face, especially in mobilizing internal and external resources for socio-economic development activities, and also strive to find solutions that are embedded in local realities and based on national ownership.

In India, we are proud of our democratic traditions and our civilizational ethos of tolerance, respect and mutual understanding. Democracy and the rule of law is the bedrock of our political structure. We have committed to ensuring fundamental rights and dignity to every citizen. Moreover, in recent years, our efforts for social and economic transformation have focused on improvement in the quality of life in an inclusive manner, that is, bringing the fruits of economic development to all sectors of our society, particularly in rural India and among the vulnerable. It is our belief that a comprehensive approach to human security is the only way that the concept will help every human being explore his or her potential to the maximum while pursuing a life of dignity in a safe and healthy environment.

India has been constructively engaged in deliberations on the issue of human security. I wish to assure you, Sir, that we will continue to do so and to work towards the early implementation of the concept for the benefit of all.

Mr. Srivali (Thailand): Allow me, first, to thank the Secretary-General for the excellent report he has submitted (A/66/763). I would also like to thank Ambassador Yukio Takasu, Special Adviser to the Secretary-General, for his untiring efforts to reach out to Member States on numerous occasions and in numerous ways in the preparation of the report pursuant to resolution 64/291. Thailand is of the opinion that the report represents a balanced view and has benefited from taking on board the broadest interpretations possible.

As Thailand is a part of the Human Security Network, I will be brief in my comments, as many of them have been well reflected in the statement delivered earlier by the Jordanian Chair.

First, Thailand welcomes the report of the Secretary-General and supports the recommendations contained therein. We believe that the report is an important step forward for the notion of human security. It submits a common understanding of the concept and identifies the emergence of a level of consensus around which the notion of human security may be framed. For Thailand, which has long supported the concept and its practical application, such affirmation is helpful indeed.

Secondly, Thailand also welcomes the common understanding of human security contained in the report. We believe that it can constitute a foundation for the consideration of future consensual applications of human security within national and international contexts.

Thirdly, we appreciate in particular the identification of specific areas where a human security approach can be useful to the work of the United Nations. In Thailand's national context, the human security approach has informed and guided people-centred, holistic and integrated policy formulation and implementation. In so doing, it has allowed us to address the global financial and economic crises, the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and critical health and health-related challenges in a pragmatic and sustainable manner.

In addition, our national efforts against trafficking in persons has benefited greatly from the outlined human security approach. It has guided us well within our national context and in the cooperation we have sought from the United Nations on those issues. We sincerely hope to be able to share our experiences with friends and build partnerships for the benefit of all concerned.

Mr. Dos Santos (Brazil): Brazil welcomes the new report of the Secretary-General on human security (A/66/763). We are also very thankful for the work carried out by Ambassador Takasu in moving the process forward.

We appreciate the report's discussion of elements that may constitute a common understanding on human security, which has stemmed from ongoing debates and consultations with Member States. We also recognize that many of the concerns raised by Brazil and other delegations in previous debates and consultations were tackled in the new report. For instance, we welcome the reaffirmation that the human security approach is consistent with the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations, including sovereignty and territorial integrity. Human security must always be regarded as a framework for the action of States.

We also recognize the value of the distinction stressed in the report between the human security approach and the responsibility to protect. In our view, development and human rights cannot always be viewed through the lens of security. We recognize, however, that sustainable peace requires a comprehensive approach to security that acknowledges its linkages to development and human rights. Non-military challenges must be dealt with by non-military approaches.

Brazil also appreciates the indication in the report of areas of the United Nations activities where the human security approach can be of added value to the Organization and its States Members. We feel, however, that further elaboration would be needed in order to demonstrate the usefulness of the human security approach in concrete terms. We would also welcome further information, especially an assessment of the results achieved by the projects carried out with the support of the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security.

Finally, Brazil is of the view that we should avoid any possible unintended misuse of the notion of human security stemming from a lack of a multilaterally agreed understanding or from a concept deemed to be too vague. Therefore, we remain committed to reaching an agreement on the definition of human security in the General Assembly. The report before us is a good step towards that goal.

Mr. Errázuriz (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): Chile, too, would like to express its gratitude for the statement made by the Deputy Secretary-General.

My country associates itself with the statement made by the Permanent Representatitve of Jordan as Chair of the Human Security Network, of which Chile is a member.

My delegation would like to thank the Secretary-General for his report on human security (A/66/763), which contains a review of the consultations that his Special Adviser, Ambassador Yukio Takasu, held with Member States, as well as valuable conclusions.

The Secretary-General, pursuant to resolution 64/291, has sought to identify those elements on which there could be shared views among States that could be used to be reach a definition of the concept in the future. Chile supports that practical approach, which seeks to move forward the mandate given by our heads of State

and Government in the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1).

It is worth pointing out that the report indicates that it is Governments that have the primary role for ensuring the dignity, well-being and survival of its citizens and that human security is a tool for assisting Governments in identifying widespread and cross-cutting threats to the prosperity of their people and the stability of their sovereignty. Respect for the sovereignty of States is the very basis of human security, as are the pillars on which the Organization is founded, namely, international peace and security, the promotion and protection of human rights and the development of peoples. In that regard, it should be emphasized that, while it is not desirable to prioritize threats to the security of individuals at the global level, it is nevertheless up to States to determine in each case the priority they give to each of those threats. In doing so, in instances when they deem it necessary, the international community could provide assistance. Such cooperation should be prompt, not only to meet a given challenge posing a threat to human security but, ideally, to prevent it. A system for early warning and preparedness of the people, for example in the case of natural disasters, could save significant human life.

With regard to natural disasters, which do not appear in the specific list in the Secretary-General's report, in particular as regards earthquakes, tsunamis, volcanic eruptions and flooding, my country unfortunately has a history in regard to all of those phenomena. One thing is sure: we never stop learning how to best prepare for those situations. With each new disaster we improve training for civilians and our laws and regulations are adapted to the new reality. Nevertheless, as the report of the Secretary-General points out, there are also man-made disasters and phenomena. One of those is the phenomenon of climate change. Without denying that there could be a natural cycle of variation in the world's climate, there is no doubt that human activity stemming from technological advances has had undesirable and unfortunate effects. The Rio+20 Conference will begin in just a few days. The Conference will have to establish a framework of action for the future in order to minimize such regrettable consequences. Undoubtedly, the human individual and the very survival of our species will have to be at the centre of those negotiations.

Human security also is a concept that must have a place in peacebuilding processes, so that the new institutional framework that is established in post-conflict countries places the human individual at the centre of its respective processes in a way that ensures the promotion of and respect for human rights, the country's development and, ultimately, international peace and security, thereby averting a country's relapse into a vicious cycle of violence.

It is the view of my delegation that the initiatives of successive Presidents of the General Assembly as well as the Assembly's own calls in resolutions on this issue constitute the fulfilment of the mandate set out by heads of State and Government in paragraph 143 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1). In that regard, my country supports the initiative of the Secretary-General, within his mandate, to appoint a Special Adviser on Human Security and to set up a Human Security Unit. The lack of a definition should not be an obstacle to moving forward in implementing this concept. My delegation is convinced that it would contribute to a greater protection of our peoples.

Mr. Haniff (Malaysia): First and foremost, I wish to thank the President for holding this debate on human security. At the same time, I wish to thank the Secretary-General for the submission of his report contained in docuemnt A/66/763, entitled "Follow-up to General Assembly resolution 64/291 on human security", which constitutes a summary of discussions on human security at the General Assembly and the attempts to forge a common understanding on the concept.

Malaysia approaches the notion of human security rather cautiously, as thus far there is no agreed definition. As such, we believe that it is necessary to continue to try to find an agreed definition based on paragraph 143 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1). Paragraph 143 also commits all of us to further discuss and define the notion of human security — something that my delegation is committed to. While we can accept a general and broad understanding, working towards an agreed definition that is accepted by all can only help in allowing the notion to be further developed and applied in the future. On the same basis, should there continue to be a lack of a conclusive definition, or even an abstract definition, one's understanding of human security may differ significantly from others', bearing in mind the differences in culture, historical background and levels of development and capacity between various countries.

In going through the report of the Secretary-General, we welcome the outline in section VII of a common understanding on human security. We appreciate that the outline takes into consideration the views of

Member States. At this juncture, allow me to present our views on some of the elements contained in the outline concerned.

Among the core values that are important to ensure greater acceptance of the concept is that human security would need to be guided by the principles enshrined in the United Nations Charter. Human security should also not replace State security. We agree that Governments should retain the primary responsibility for ensuring the survival, livelihood and dignity of their peoples and populations.

Malaysia also believes that human security must be based on local realities, as the political, economic, social and cultural conditions vary significantly between one country and the next. National ownership is therefore of the utmost importance to the people of a country in the advancement of human security. The international community should complement the efforts of Governments, based on their requests, to enhance their ability to respond to threats, especially those that are multidimensional and cross-cutting and require assistance from others.

We also take note of the fact that the notion of human security is distinct from the responsibility to protect. However, the distinction should not only be confined to the application of the notion, but should also avoid the possibility of using force or the threat of force against a State or its people. Malaysia firmly believes that there is a need to rule out any possibility of resorting to humanitarian intervention or even harmful sanctions. We cannot accept the paradox of creating insecurity in the name of human security, which would only defeat the purpose of the notion itself.

Malaysia also believes that there should not be any double standards or selectivity, nor should there be manipulation in the application of the concept of human security. It should be applied equally to all problems and threats that beset the peoples of the world.

Malaysia's own national development experience has always taken into account the elements of economic and social development, with the welfare of the people consistently at the forefront of policy considerations. At the heart of those policies was the need to distribute the benefits of economic growth equitably in order to overcome potentially dangerous national rifts. As such, Malaysia will continue to advocate a comprehensive approach to threats posed by, among other things, disparities in economic opportunities; infectious diseases; illegal migration; environmental pollution and degradation; illicit drug production and trafficking; human trafficking and smuggling in persons; and international terrorism.

While Malaysia acknowledges the notion of human security, we are concerned about its broad application, which makes any operational use of the notion difficult and complex. In this day and age, there are a number of threats that individuals face depending on the situation in the country and in the region. Often, even solutions to certain threats are themselves under threat. For instance, greater financial and human resources are required to overcome the problems of climate change and post-conflict peacebuilding. However, resources are difficult to acquire, especially in the light of the global financial and economic crisis facing almost all Governments, be they from developed or developing countries. Therefore, we would appreciate further clarification on the application of the concept of human security.

We look forward to hearing more on the aspects of operationalizing the concept of human security. At the same time, we also look forward to efforts to formulate what would constitute a concept that would be acceptable to all.

Mr. Butt (Pakistan): At the outset, I would like to thank Mr. Takasu, Special Adviser to the Secretary-General, for his tireless efforts in reaching out to the majority of Member States with a view to listening, understanding and effectively accommodating their concerns vis-à-vis this new term, human security. As a result of those wide-ranging consultations, the Secretary-General's report (A/66/763) on the subject that we are today gathered to discuss has made some very important pronouncements on the nature, scope and implementation of human security. Those pronouncements are not only helpful in assuaging some of the well-founded concerns, but will also pave the way for a smooth and consensual implementation of this useful concept.

We are happy that the following important points, which are the cornerstone of any edifice to be built for international cooperation, are duly reflected in the report: first, full respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Member States; secondly, adherence to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations; thirdly, the primary responsibility of a State to determine and address challenges and threats to its

population; fourthly, international cooperation to assist a State in performing its duties and responsibilities; and, lastly, a reaffirmation of the fundamental principle that human security is distinct from the responsibility to protect and does not involve the use of force.

While not conclusive, the report of the Secretary-General has also highlighted some important areas where this concept can be used and may produce desirable results. Specific projects in these areas that take into account the needs of affected populations and help Member States in addressing related challenges would pave the way for ensuring the quality of life of and necessary security for their populations. It is also encouraging that the report acknowledges the equal status of, and the inextricable link among, social, political, economic and cultural rights. Clearly, the violation of a set of those rights undermines all others.

Both history and the recent humanitarian, financial and food crises have shown how those who are on the frontlines of hardship are also likely to be the victims of the ripple effect of human rights violations. We therefore believe that the notion of human security must have a development-oriented focus that ensures equitable progress and address inherent inequalities that lead to violations of human rights in all societies. Achieving the right to development must therefore become one of the central pillars of this important notion of human security.

Another important dimension of this concept is addressing those threats and challenges that are not locally driven or created, but are the result of international policies and systems, such as the recent global financial crisis, which severely affected developing countries, although they did not contribute to it. Accordingly, we believe that an overhauling and democratization of the international political and economic structure is the need of the day and would contribute meaningfully to the achievement of human security goals at all levels.

We have taken note of the interest of partners in negotiating a substantive resolution on this subject that would strive to achieve a common understanding and definition of this important concept.

We would like to assure the Assembly of our constructive engagement on the subject. We also hope that partners will avoid bringing controversial concepts into the discussion, which would undermine the value of this important and useful notion. At the same time, we would like partners to reaffirm the core principles that I just mentioned and that are well enumerated in the Secretary-General's report.

In conclusion, we wish the proponents of this concept well and encourage them to continue to advance the concept in the framework of the General Assembly and on the basis of a consensus that will ensure its wider acceptability and effective implementation.

Ms. Alsaleh (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): At the outset, I would like to thank the Secretary-General for his report entitled "Follow-up to General Assembly resolution 64/291 on human security" (A/66/763). We have taken note of that report and the efforts of the Secretary-General aimed at achieving common acceptance of the concept of human security in order to guarantee the rights of peoples to development and to live in freedom and dignity, without poverty or despair and so that they can enjoy equal rights and develop their human capacities in the best possible way.

My country was one of the first States to demonstrate its interest in the concept of human security and ha- contributed to highlighting the importance of achieving a clear and precise definition of this important concept, on the basis of our conviction that any ambiguous definition of the concept would lead to politicization and unilateral interpretations of the concept, undermining the very foundations of international law governing international relations. All of those factors could endanger the implementation of this important concept.

We have read with great interest the Secretary-General's report and would like to stress that, despite the efforts of the Secretary-General to satisy all parties by covering the fundamental issues related to human security, the report has ignored extremely important issues that this concept should cover, as they are crucial priorities for developing States. Any discussion that seeks to reach a common understanding on the concept of human security must be carried out on the basis of a commitment to the purposes and principles set out in the United Nations Charter. First and foremost, those include respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity, the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of States and the exclusive responsibility of a State to protect its own citizens and to assess the threats and dangers that its people face in terms of security, including ways to overcome those threats. All international assistance should be provided on the basis of a request by the State concerned and once it has given its consent, in

accordance with the international consensus reflected in a number of United Nations resolutions dealing with humanitarian issues, in particular resolution 46/182. That has also been reaffirmed in the Secretary-General's report, specifically in paragraphs 2, 19 and 36 (a), (b), (c) and (d), in which he states that human security is based on the United Nations Charter and "does not replace State security".

We would like to affirm that any attempt to redefine those principles or limit them must be firmly rejected. Furthermore, this concept must also include certain important questions, namely, first, the principles on which international humanitarian law is founded, in particular the right to self-determination of peoples, especially the rights of people living under the yoke of foreign occupation and the inalienable right of all peoples to exploit their national resources in accordance with international law. Secondly, the definition of the concept must be based on the right to development, as it is a fundamental right and a major challenge. Without that, we will not be able to ensure the development of peoples and, therefore, their human security. We hope that the definition will be built on sustainable human development and on economic development by eliminating poverty and underdevelopment, by bridging the gap between North and South, by transferring technology, by ensuring justice and energy security and by working against unilateral economic sanctions against developing countries imposed by States and entities outside the framework of international law. It is important to deal with the issue of peoples who have been subject to military invasion and people living under foreign occupation, so that such acts are not repeated in the future. We must also put an end to economic blockades, particularly in the occupied Palestinian territories and the occupied Golan Heights.

It is also necessary to avoid any linkages between the principle of human security and that of the responsibility to protect, because any attempt to link them will only be put forward by powerful countries to justify interfering in the internal affairs of other States. It is Governments that are principally responsible for the security and protection of their citizens. The role of the international community must be limited to providing the necessary support to promote national capacities, with the consent of the Government concerned, as we have already stressed. That would allow Governments to play their due role through effective partnerships between them and regional and international organizations and civil society. That will ensure that the concept of human security is based on serving humankind.

Even more important, the concept of human security must be universal and not applied selectively. Were this concept to be adopted, we should ensure that it is not used in a selective way or used to justify involvement in the internal affairs of developing countries or to impose economic sanctions on people in certain countries. As we see human security, it is a concept that must also cover developed countries. They must not be immune from this concept simply because of their military power or the means to invade other countries. We must put an end to double standards, selectivity and politicization of issues concerning human rights so that this concept applies to all States without any discrimination.

In conclusion, we would like to reiterate that the definition of the concept and framework of human security first and foremost, as we see it, aims at promoting respect for human dignity in order to allow humankind to live free from poverty, hunger, disease and want and to contribute to eliminating the underlying causes of violence, extremism, terrorism, conflict, invasion and foreign occupation. Any definition of human security must first establish mechanisms to build greater trust between States. It must not be used as a pretext for foreign interference or for justifying a lack of respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Member States, which must give their consent for any measures to be taken under this concept.

Mr. Hassani Nejad Pirkouhi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to begin my comments on the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/66/763 by thanking the Deputy Secretary-General for her presentation of the report earlier this morning, and by noting the positive elements it contains in an effort to establish a common understanding of human security. In particular, paragraph 36 of the report tries to address serious concerns that Member States have expressed during previous debates on the subject. We find it helpful in bridging the gap in understanding the notion of human security.

We welcome the report's reaffirmation of the rights and responsibilities of national Governments in ensuring the survival, livelihood and dignity of their citizens, and of the complementary role of the international community in providing support for national Governments when requested, while fully respecting the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter,

including the sovereignty of States and their territorial integrity and the principle of non-interference. We also note that, according to the report, human security does not entail additional legal obligations on the part of States and underscores the universality of fundamental freedoms in developing and developed countries alike while it strengthens solutions that are based on national ownership.

That being said, on the one hand the report unfortunately fails to address, or avoids addressing, root causes of insecurity in the world, and on the other mostly confines itself to community and national levels, almost totally overlooking the systemic sources of human insecurity, and therefore the responsibility of those who perpetrate them. After all, the fact is that the nature and genesis of various global challenges and crises — whether the current economic and financial crisis or others such as those related to food, energy, climate and conflict — are clearly systemic. They are putting the security of people everywhere in peril. The solution therefore should address long-standing, severe inequalities and persistent failures at a systemic level. A substantive lack of global security, the result of misconduct on the part of major political and economic players, continues to put the livelihood and dignity of people around the globe at constant risk.

Concerning the notion of human security and its mainstreaming into the work of the United Nations, we would like to reiterate our concerns about the unreliability of the current multilateral and international system, characterized by huge deficits in fairness and impartiality. While resorting to selective approaches and double standards is common practice, concepts are regularly and cynically being misinterpreted out of their original context, or applied arbitrarily in only a few cases, whenever and however that may be desired by the most powerful. In the meantime, the real sources of insecurity and their clients can rest assured of their patrons' unconditional support and enjoy full impunity.

Mr. Tian Lin (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): The Chinese delegation wishes to thank the President for convening this debate on the Secretary-General's report entitled "Follow-up to General Assembly resolution 64/291 on human security" (A/66/763). China has noted that in the report the Secretary-General emphasizes the need for bringing human security into line with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, namely, respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of nations and non-interference in the internal affairs of States. Governments retain a primary role in ensuring the survival, livelihood and dignity of their citizens, and the international community is there to provide necessary support to Governments on their request. China endorses those principles.

At the same time, China continues to believe that human security is essentially a development issue. The United Nations should pay more attention to development and expand its contribution to it. It should help developing countries eradicate poverty as soon as possible and achieve sustainable economic and social development. Only then can human security be assured. That is also the common understanding of the broad spectrum of the membership from developing countries, and should therefore be appropriately reflected in the definition of human security.

Since the adoption of resolution 64/291, Member States have held extensive discussions on the definition of human security, detailing their respective understanding and concerns about it. However, they have different interpretations of its definition and how to implement it. According to the Secretary-General's report, the pursuit of human security overlaps the maintenance of international peace and security and the promotion and protection of human rights. The relationship between those concepts must be further clarified. China supports the majority of the membership in their continued efforts to hold in-depth discussions on the implications and expansion of human security, in an attempt to achieve a clear, unambiguous and widely accepted definition that can contribute to the accurate implementation of the concept of human security and the effective achievement of freedom from fear and freedom from want, as outlined in the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1).

Mr. De Vega (Philippines): At the outset, the Philippines wishes to welcome and support the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/66/763, on the follow-up to resolution 64/291, on human security. We also salute Ambassador Takasu for his tireless efforts to advance the concept of human security.

In brief, we fully adhere to the report's elucidation in section IV of the scope of the notion of human security. Human security does indeed have broader application than the responsibility to protect, and thus brings together the three pillars of the United Nations system and focuses on widespread and cross-cutting threats to people's survival, livelihood and dignity. We also note

the report's support of United Nations activities in areas where the human security approach can be useful, and we wish to emphasize the following.

First, on climate change and climate-related hazardous events, the Philippines, as one of the countries of the world most vulnerable to natural disasters, fully supports the report's emphasis on the importance of mainstreaming disaster reduction and risk management into national development plans. In previous years, the Philippines Government agency in charge of natural disasters took a reactive approach that focused on responding to disasters once they had occurred. Under the new paradigm shift, we have revitalized our efforts and renamed it the National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council, thereby signalling that we are now following a more preventive, and not just a reactive, approach.

Secondly, on post-conflict peacebuilding, the Philippines, as a democratic country, has always emphasized a people-centred approach, including the delivery of essential basic services and the strengthening of the rule of law. We will continue to support the United Nations system in the area of peacekeeping and support the idea that addressing inequities, advancing economic prosperity and justice and solving the social problems of communities are key to reducing conflict in all areas of the world.

Thirdly, on the global financial and economic crisis and the Millennium Development Goals, we essentially view the human security approach as especially valuable for people of developing countries. It is true that the current crisis affects the lives of everyone on the planet, yet it is undeniable that for countries where being poor means living in conditions of debilitating abject poverty, a crisis becomes not just a matter of lifestyle change, but could also actually mean a question of life or death. We therefore support the report in specifying the need for a protection and empowerment framework that strengthens human security and minimizes the long-term consequences of financial and economic downturns.

We have heard today from the representative of Japan that his country would commit additional contributions to the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security. We commend Japan and would like to mention that the Philippines has benefited from projects supported by the Fund. Those projects relate to the economic and social empowerment of returned victims of trafficking, integrated community-based reproductive health and family planning, and preventive actions and early interventions against child abuse and exploitation in urban poor communities. That is the advancement of human security at work.

Lastly, the Philippines joins other delegations in expressing our appreciation for the report's reaffirmation that human security should be based on the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, including respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of States. Accordingly, we believe that advancement of the rule of law and recourse to peaceful means in the settlement of disputes, including arbitration and mediation, are therefore vital elements in the advancement of the human security approach. The Philippines will continue to fully subscribe to that idea.

The Acting President: We have heard the last speaker in today's debate. The Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda items 14 and 117.

Agenda item 7 (*continued*)

Organization of work, adoption of the agenda and allocation of items

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a report of the Fifth Committee (A/66/544/Add.1) on sub-item (k) agenda item 115, entitled "Appointment of members and alternate members of the United Nations Staff Pension Committee". In order for the Assembly to consider the report of the Fifth Committee under the sub-item, it will be necessary to reopen the consideration of sub-item (k) of agenda item 115.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to reopen its consideration of sub-item (k) of agenda item 115 and proceed immediately to its consideration?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 115 (*continued*)

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments

(k) Appointment of members and alternate members of the United Nations Staff Pension Committee

Report of the Fifth Committee (A/66/544/Add.1)

The Acting President: In paragraph 3 of its report, the Fifth Committee recommends that the General

Assembly appoint Mr. Hitoshi Kozaki of Japan as a member of the United Nations Staff Pension Committee for a term of office beginning today, 4 June 2012, and ending on 31 December 2012.

May I take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to appoint Mr. Hitoshi Kozaki of Japan as a member of the United Nations Staff Pension Committee for a term of office beginning on 4 June 2012 and ending on 31 December 2012?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (k) of agenda item 115?

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.